

## **REMARKS**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the detailed remarks.

Claims 4, 5, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Examiner apparently rejects the limitation independent of a crash event and suggests this limitation was not reasonably or sufficiently described in the specification as originally filed. Applicant wishes to draw the Examiner's attention to Figure 2 which illustrates the speed related deployment discrimination in which the deployment algorithm decision threshold increases and then later decreases thereby reasonably conveying to one skilled in the relevant art that the deployment algorithm decision threshold is adjusted independent of a crash event. Furthermore, not only did the deployment algorithm decision threshold increase, it then later decreased while the vehicle was moving. That is, the algorithm decision threshold increases and decreases without the occurrence of a crash event. This sort of response supports Applicant's limitations in claims 4, 5, and 15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Okada* (6305709). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As previously discussed, *Okada* operates only after receiving a trigger signal from the triggering/resetting signal means 44 [Col. 7, lines 25-33]. *Okada* is therefore a control for *how* the airbag deploys – not whether the airbag deploys as recited and claimed by Applicant. Notably, claims 1, 10, and 15 recite desensitizing the deployment algorithm which is simply inapplicable and unachievable by the *Okada* reference which controls how the airbag deploys, not whether the airbag deploys. That is, *Okada* operates after the trigger signal is activated and it would make no sense to desensitize the algorithm after the airbag triggering decision has been made. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

The remaining rejections also utilize *Okada* as a primary reference and are thus improper for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference will facilitate moving this case forward to being issued, Applicant's representative can be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/David L. Wisz/

DAVID L. WISZ

Registration No. 46,350

Attorneys for Applicant

400 West Maple, Suite 350

Birmingham, Michigan 48009

(248) 988-8360

Dated: January 18, 2008